

296898

SA.

2020-218-E

RECEIVED
1/29/21

to d

From: Alex <a111e1x@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:05 AM

To: Wilson, Elise <Elise.Wilson@psc.sc.gov>; PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>

Cc: Campbell, Chad <ccampbell@ors.sc.gov>; Bateman, Andrew <abateman@ors.sc.gov>; Wilhite, Sarah <swilhite@ors.sc.gov>; Kirby, Brad <bkirby@ors.sc.gov>; Self, Amanda <ASelf@scconsumer.gov>;

PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: [External] Re: Complaint 2021-01-25 Kadoshnikov, Alex.pdf

Good morning commissioners, attached is a letter that I will be sending via regular mail as well. If you do not receive the attachment please let me know. If this was not shared with all parties please send it to them as well, thank you so much.

Kindly, Alex.

RECEIVED

JAN 29 2021

PSC SC
MAIL / DMS

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2020-218-E

The Honorable Jocelyn G. Boyd,
 Chief Clerk/ Executive Director
 Justin T. Williams
 Florence P. Belser
 Stephen "Mike" Caston
 Carolyn "Carolee" L. Williams
 Thomas J. "Tom" Ervin
 Headen B. Thomas
 Delton W. Powers
 Public Service Commission of South Carolina

Good morning commissioners and may it please the court. I called in with questions a while back and the Commission asked me to write them in so that they can be seen by all. I have sent in many questions to which I have yet to get an answer to. I called in and spoke with Colanthia B. Alvarez and was informed that the commission would answer my questions the day of my hearing. I explained to Mrs. Alvarez that that would be too late and that the answers that I receive now would send me in one direction or another so that I needed them answered. She then told me that maybe the Office of Regulatory Staff would be able to answer my questions. I spoke with Chad Jackson (if I remember correctly) and he said he did not have the answers to these questions.

Question # 1: When will my questions be answered?

Question # 2: When multiple parties granted me permission and when Duke Energy came to my house to pick up payment. What are the consequences for false accusations?

"The most serious consequence would be that the person would face perjury charges, as it is illegal to knowingly make false statements while under oath during court proceedings. Perjury is actually a separate criminal charge that may be punishable by criminal fines and/or jail sentences."¹

1

<https://www.legalmatch.com/law-library/article/false-accusations-and-abuse-claims.html#:~:text=The%20most%20serious%20consequence%20would,fines%20and%2For%20jail%20sentences.>

Question # 3: The Commission is aware that:

"smart meters are illegal first because they lack a path for surges to go to ground, and second because they have inadequate surge protection.

Smart meters are not grounded at all, and their surge protection is good only up to 300 volts. When trees fall and two 240 volt lines get crossed, 480 volts enters smart meters. They explode and catch fire. Around 2,000 amps flows into the building and burns out wiring, equipment, and appliances. The analog meters being replaced are well grounded and have a robust spark gap protector, which easily shunts a 480 volt surge to ground."

What steps has the commission taken to protect the public? Please explain in detail.

Question # 4: I addressed in my last letter to the commission that what Duke Energy Charged was not what I used. And therefore if this holds true for smart meters and the fact that they are overcharging the customers of South Carolina, and customers are forced to pay what they have not used. What are the consequences to this practice?

Question # 5: I have shown where Duke Energy has failed to answer a sea of questions from me, because if they had attempted, this case would not be where it is today and would have been resolved two years ago. Duke Energy is before the judge today and they have not answered any questions, they have failed to comply with laws of the Federal government, State government, and Local governments. And yet the commission has shown them leniency and stricken all my evidence from the record. I have shown where they broke law, after law, and their request was granted, why?

Sub question b) What have they done, to show the court that they are cooperating?

Question # 6: The commission chose to strike all my evidence from the record. What exactly in the record did the commission find that violated any law or statute, or was out of context for the commission to strike it from the record?

Sub question b) If there is something that the commission feels should not be there, please be specific about it and let me know so that I can fix it?

Question # 7: I sent in this statement from one of my letters: "I am beyond surprised how much Duke Energy can defend themselves without addressing one point of my argument. It is beyond me how many moves they are making on the chess board and not one thing has been accomplished, or said to prove that they are producing clean safe power along with all my other arguments. And without addressing one issue, at every turn they point fingers my way. How about we talk about the issues? I demand a full investigation into this matter. How can we have an investigation if the commission strikes my testimony?"

Sub question b) What can we discuss if all my points are stricken from the record?

Sub question c) **The mission statement of the Public Service Commission:** For the regulated entities, facilitate the provision of safe services at levels of quality and reliability which

satisfy customer needs. ... Seek to ensure that the regulatory process results in fair and reasonable outcomes. ... Provide an open, accessible and efficient regulatory process which is fair, cost effective and unbiased, while also exploring alternative methods of regulating the entities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. ... Seek to ensure that all regulated entities' services to consumers comply with all legal requirements subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. If the public service commission's mission is to provide safe services, to be fair and have reasonable outcomes, to have a open, accessible and efficient regulatory process which is fair (stated a second time) and cost effective and unbiased (right now everything was thrown out and no comments were made), and to comply with all legal requirements to the commission's jurisdiction. Can the Commission show me how they plan on investigating this matter without any evidence?

Sub question d) How can the commission investigate the safe services by throwing out all my arguments where Duke Energy is operating unsafely?

Sub question e) If Duke Energy had nothing to lose/ if they were not hiding anything/ if they knew they were doing everything legally they would not have asked my case to be dismissed, then asked for the evidence to be stricken from the record. And in so doing they show that they have a lot to lose and yet the court ruled in their favor. Please explain your logic, if the commission's mission statement is to provide safe, fair, cost effective and unbiased... services to consumers?

Sub question f) Share with me what are the consequences when a utility is untruthful before the people of South Carolina? What fines can they be expected to pay? Is there jail time for senior executives? How about for the lawyers presenting the case, what consequences happen to them?

Question # 8: I wrote in my earlier letters that "Genocide is a war crime and dictators have been taken out (the American military goes in and removes them from power after destroying key points) for this, and now it is happening in the state of South Carolina and the Commission is not even winking an eye, it saddens me that people are falling ill and dying daily." Four of my neighbors have died since the installation of smart meters. The Commission has sided with Duke Energy and closed its eyes to this serious issue.

Sub question b: Can each commissioner be held liable?

Sub question c: Can the Commission as a whole be liable?

Sub question d: Can the chief clerk be held liable?

Question #9: Smart meter expert Mr. Bill Bathgate says the following:

"...there is no Federal or State law that specifically calls for an AMI meter. This AMI technology is specified in Federal law as a voluntary option for consumers not mandatory.

Forcing 100% compliance to AMI metering is not the solution; this will only lead to big legal troubles for the MPSC as a whole and direct legal liability to all individual MPSC members. Based on the testimony already made regarding AMI meter health issues the MPSC needs to step up and fulfill its charter to the residents of Michigan to provide SAFE and reliable power and not leave this to the sole discretion of the utilities. The

current AMI meters are not safe, as evidenced of the dramatic testimony of residents that are suffering terribly and the engineering analysis such as I and many others in this field have performed. If the MPSC approves these rule changes, then the MPSC should disband because your role in governance is of no value, merit or benefit to the citizens of the State of Michigan who are paying your salaries. You would have abrogated your governance role to the utilities to do as they see fit for their own exclusive benefit and no one else."

Then every resident in this state is entitled to - upon request have their analog meter installed back on their house by Federal law. If I am wrong in this statement please let me know, how?

Question #10: The commission ruled without saying a word (no commentary given) to strike my testimony from the record in the favor of Duke Energy, while its mission statement states "fair and reasonable outcomes." The commission wanted facts, I provided scientific documents from scientists from all around the world and gave the commission what they wanted. If it was screenshots that the commission did not approve of in my evidence please show me where on the books they are outlawed? And if they are not allowed in the state of South Carolina I can remove them.

Sub question b: What laws did the commission use in making the ruling to strike my evidence from my case *** MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION THAT HAS TO BE ANSWERED

Question #11: If the Commission has heard previous cases regarding smart meters, please share those links so that I can go through and see what the trial will be like, how witnesses are called, and what knowledge the Commission has heard before on the smart meter issue.

Question #12: How many witnesses and experts testify?

Sub question b) How much time will each have?

Sub question c) How long will the trial last?

Sub question d) How much time will I have to question Duke Energy?

Sub question e) Are they required to answer all my questions?

Sub question f) If they lie under oath, what are the consequences? Explain in detail please.

Question #13 I demand the Public Service Commission to compel Duke Energy to provide my daily usage since the bi-directional meter has been installed. If they say that they can not because their information is sent to them only once a month I remind the Commission the following: "Smart meters have an exterior terminal port. Anyone with the right size optical probe can plug into it and have complete access to the meter, the home, and the network."

Duke Energy is the party that has broken the law and can not ask for everything to be thrown out. The Commission should look at everything that I present. It is the obligation of Duke Energy to prove that they are providing SAFE POWER.

Please reverse your decision to strike my testimony.

If you side with the people, I believe there is still hope for this great nation, and this beautiful State of South Carolina that we all call home.

Respectfully,

Alex